



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

(London: Williams & Norgate, 1899; pp. viii + 122; 2s.) The author examines in succession three theories of the resurrection of Jesus: (1) the swoon theory—first advocated by Paulus, and still having English adherents; (2) the vision and apparition theories—advocated by Strauss and Dr. Martineau; (3) the theory of conspiracy—advocated by John Vickers in a book entitled *The Real Jesus: A Review of His Life, Character, and Death, from a Jewish Standpoint*. In answer to these theories the author does not attempt to meet theory with philosophy, but instead urges the historic facts narrated in the gospels. Herein lies the value and strength of the book. It is, however, also the place of its greatest weakness, for, though appealing to history, it does so uncritically, or rather ignoring criticism. All statements of the gospel writers are regarded as having equal historical value. Thus the usefulness of the book is limited to a great extent to the class of uncritical readers.—WM. R. SCHOEMAKER.

Christenverfolgungen. Geschichte ihrer Ursachen im Römerreiche. Von J. E. Weis, Dr. phil. (= Veröffentlichungen aus dem kirchenhistorischen Seminar, München, No. 2.) (München: J. J. Lentner'sche Buchhandlung, 1899; pp. xii + 179; M. 2.40.) The problems connected with the attitude of the Roman empire toward the Christians have been subjected during the past decade to a very careful reëxamination from many quarters. They have been attacked largely in detail, however, and therefore a summary of results, with the presentation of the subject in its historical development, such as is given in this treatise, is most welcome. It is the outcome of work done in the church-history seminar at Munich. Weis has made a very thorough study of the sources and of recent literature. English works like those of Hardy and Ramsay receive careful consideration. The only omissions of importance in the references are the later articles of Mommsen, Sanday, and Ramsay in the *Expositor* of 1893-4. The conclusion of Weis on the contested problem of persecution "for the name" is that Christians were persecuted as such even under Nero. He holds that under Trajan the milder policy consisted in the endeavor to secure from the accused Christian a renunciation of his faith with the assurance that his past would not weigh against him. From that time on the policy of the administration was to induce apostasy in every way. This purpose of repression yielded to a policy of oppression under Decius. Weis emphasizes very strongly the view that the mere fact of being a Christian was in practically every case the ground of imperial action. It is

very probable that he has failed to give credit to the evidence in favor of the accusation and punishment of Christians as guilty in some cases of actual crimes.—*Étude sur le cénobitisme pachomien pendant le iv^e siècle et la première moitié du v^e.* Dissertation présentée à la faculté de théologie de l'université de Louvain pour l'obtention du grade de docteur. Par Paulin Ladeuze. (Louvain : J. Van Linthout, 1898 ; pp. ix + 390.) The beginnings of Christian asceticism in its various forms of eremitism, cenobitism, and monasticism strictly so called are found in Egypt in the early Christian centuries. The study of them forms an obscure and difficult subject. The documents are in at least four languages, Latin, Greek, Coptic, and Arabic, and have been worked upon by few scholars. M. Amelineau in France and Herr Grutzmacher in Germany have in recent years made the most important contributions to the problems involved. This thesis is the most recent discussion, and is written with an admirable combination of clearness and scholarly scientific method. The original documents have been carefully studied, and independence of judgment is shown throughout. The author has specially in view the conclusions of M. Amelineau, which he vigorously combats on several vital points. He holds that the Greek life of Pachomius is the fundamental document rather than the Coptic or Arabic texts. A strong argument is made against the assertions of Amelineau concerning the moral corruption of the Egyptian monks. Certainly a charge of exaggeration in this particular is successfully maintained. The author is a Roman Catholic, and his inclination may bias his judgment, yet his evident desire to be fair and his command of the materials leave the impression that he has advanced our knowledge upon this important subject.—G. S. GOODSPEED.

Das Recht des Bekenntnisses zur Auferstehung des Fleisches. Von Lic. theol. Karl Bornhäuser, Divisionspfarrer in Rastatt. (= "Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie," herausgegeben von H. Schlatter und H. Cremer, Vol. III, Heft 2b.) (Gütersloh : C. Bertelsmann, 1899 ; pp. 63 ; M. 1.) Our author believes in a "resurrection of the flesh," and furthermore prefers its most unmitigated expression to the use either of an almost coëval credal variant, "resurrection of the dead," or a modification preferred by Luther, "resurrection of the body." He finds, however, this *Fleischesauferstehung* rejected by liberal and almost surrendered by conservative theologians, while the common people so little understand it that they would without compunction abridge the church year by observing Holy Thursday or Good